



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/871,368	05/31/2001	Atsushi Murashima	14667	1756
23389	7590	12/27/2005	EXAMINER	
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC			OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N	
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 300			2655	
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530				

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/871,368	MURASHIMA, ATSUSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael N. Opsasnick	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 7-26 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 27-31 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

2. Claims 7-26 are allowable over the prior art of record.

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

As per the allowable claims, the recited limitations pertaining to the calculation of voicing parameters to determining voiced/unvoiced audio input is not explicitly taught by the prior art of record.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Specification***

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-5,27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takada (6088670).

As per claims 1,5, Takada (6088670) teaches:

“a voice detecting method.....voice signal” as voice detector for frames of speech  
(col. 2 lines 45-50)

“using feature quantity.....voice signal” as using a zero measure to determine  
voiced/unvoiced (col. 5 lines 10-22)

“using a long-time average.....filters” as using a long term averaging measure  
(col. 5 line 23-31)

As per claim 2, Takada (6088670) teaches:

“wherein.....average thereof” as using the long-term average and a feature  
quantity (col. 5 lines 23-55)

As per claim 3, Takada (6088670) teaches:

“wherein said filters are switched....past” as switching the smoothing value filter based upon the averaging value (col. 7 lines 4-20)

As per claim 4, Takada (6088670) teaches using past measures of coefficients (col. 7 lines 15-20).

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeJaco (5911128).

As per claims 27-31, DeJaco (5911128) teaches voiced/unvoiced/noise discrimination (col. 5 lines 15-24) measuring the parameters using five distinct calculations (col. 5 lines 40-54), of which one, the energy differential calculation comparing the energy of the current frame against an average frame (long time) energy, and calculating the differential between the two (col. 9 line 24 – lines. 48). Examiner notes that the claim scope of claims 27-31 pertain to a choice of 3 to 4 different calculations; the differential

energy calculation of DeJaco meets the claim scope of one of the alternatives listed in claims 27-31.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As per applicants arguments on pages 3-5 of the response with respect to change quantities, examiner disagrees and argues that the differential taught by the reference is a differential between frames, each frame representing quantities in a different time frame, and hence the differential represents a change quantity in time. As per the arguments presented on pages 5-7 of the response, examiner notes that the J1 values is dependent upon a past determination → the newer frame that is used in one calculation becomes the previous frame on the next calculation, and therefore the new J1 value is based upon a past determination. The example given at the end of page 5 of the arguments presented pertain to the specification, and not the claim scope; although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Wayne Young, can be reached at (571)272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno  
12/19/05



RICHEMOND DORVIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER